

ONI BUDGET WORK GROUP

January 12, 2009

Attendees	Christina Albo, Katherine Anderson, Trish Baker, Ann Balzell, Bill Barber, William Barnes, Richard Bixby, Sylvia Bogart, Jan Campbell, Ronault Catalani, Nickole Cheron, Paige Coleman, Brad Dennis, Anne Dufey, Vicki Hersen, James Heston, Cece Hughley-Noel, Leah Hyman, Michael Kersting, Ron Laster, Sandra Lefrancois, Paul Leistner, Jane Netboy, Linda Nettekovan, Mary Parkrose, Jerry Powell, Midge Purcell, Dora Reyna, Joseph Santos-Lyons, Tom Schaper, Doretta Schrock, Mary Ann Schwab, Mark Sieber, Natalya Sobolevskaya, Anna Volkova, Frank Walsh, Jonah Willbach, Jeri Williams
ONI Staff	Amalia Alarcon de Morris, Amy Archer, Kelly Ball, Michael Boyer, Celeste Carey, John Dutt, Brian Hoop, Michael Kersting, Dennis LoGiudice, Kezia MacAlistaire, Judith Mowry, Stephanie Reynolds
Facilitator	Joe Hertzberg

Introductory Remarks

Amalia reminded the group that everyone is doing important work and no one is expendable. This process is about making difficult choices together to preserve our effectiveness and our partnership. This is very hard work, and we can handle more than we think as long as we work together.

Commissioner Fritz emphasized that we must go through the process prescribed by the Council, but that ultimately we will advocate together for the “right” budget for ONI. History shows that we can be very effective when we hang together. She advised that it was not the time yet to reach out to Commissioners to advocate for the programs. Right now, our task is to work on the submission; the time for advocacy will come later.

As we have in previous meetings, we once again worked through the top-line numbers: ONI’s current budget is about \$6.7 million. We must submit two budgets for FY2009-10. The first will cut about 14% or \$930,000. The second will cut 16% or \$1,066,000. Because so much of our funding has been “one-time only,” the labels “2.5%” and “5.0%” actually translate into approximately 14% and 16% of our total general fund budget. We will also submit a third budget, the “right budget” for ONI under the current circumstances.

Prioritization of Four Program Centers

Because the City process requires us to prioritize among ONI’s four program centers, we conducted a straw vote. The results were:

1. Neighborhood Resource Center
2. Crime Prevention
- 3/4 Information & Referral and Livability

Styles of Consensus-building

Joe reviewed what we have learned building consensus in our diverse group:

- ♦ Consensus is important to help us arrive at the very best divisions and to ensure that we will all support them.

- ◆ No one is entirely familiar with every culture represented in this group. It would be very easy to offend someone due to our differences, and not even know it.
- ◆ Everyone needs to be patient, listen, and work to develop trust within the group.
- ◆ There is a difference between blocking a decision and making a conscientious objection.
- ◆ Some cultures value group solidarity so highly that people choose to go along rather than expressing their own opinion. For people in these cultures, silence does not mean agreement.
- ◆ There are two different adversarial traditions in western culture: One seeks to win by overstating positions and arguing loudly; the other seeks to find the very best solution by testing and challenging every idea. These are very different, but easy to confuse. For people who believe in testing and challenging every idea, argument does not mean disagreement.
- ◆ We must work together to make our setting as comfortable as possible for everyone to share their thoughts and feelings.
- ◆ Our language may get complex, fast, or technical. People should ask the speaker to stop and repeat their statements. The whole group needs to take responsibility for calling things out (use of acronyms, etc.)

Review of Proposed Budget Cuts

Amy presented a preliminary proposal based on submissions from all programs and contractors except DCL groups. Following is a grossly simplified summary:

- ◆ First Round – Internal ONI cuts without reducing personnel: \$207,000.
- ◆ Second Round – External grantee cuts: \$177,000.
[Subtotal after Round 1 and 2: \$384,000.]
- ◆ Third Round – Include staff reductions: \$548,000.
[Subtotal after Round 1, 2 & 3: \$932,000. This meets the 14% requirement and falls short of the 16% requirement by \$134,000.]
- ◆ Fourth Round – Options to achieve 16% requirement.

Small groups met to suggest changes and request additional information. ONI staff kept detailed notes and will provide further information and revision. Written notes submitted by five groups are appended.

Timeline

- ◆ Steering Committee: Friday, January 16, 9:00-11:00.
- ◆ **Work Group: Wednesday, January 21, 6:00-8:30, Portland Building Room C.**
- ◆ **Work Group: Thursday January 22, 2:00-5:00, NAYA Family Center, 5135 NE Columbia Blvd (NOTE the location change - and special thanks to NAYA!)**
- ◆ Proposed budget due to Commissioner Fritz: Monday, January 26.
- ◆ Proposed budget due to Office of Management & Budget: Monday, February 2.

Appendix: Small group budget notes

Group 1

- ◆ Coalitions
 - Any room for efficiencies? Why the middleman?
 - Already pretty efficient. Shared resources for NAs. Coalitions are staff for NAs.
- ◆ DCL groups need to present proposals. Need to take some cuts. E-time?
- ◆ What if coalitions cut 7% under Round Two instead of 5%? Would help prevent the proposed 20% cut to mediation.
- ◆ Would like to see much deeper cuts to graffiti contracts.

Group 2

- ◆ Graffiti – cut contracts, enforce ordinances for owners to clean up graffiti, community service/inmates (not taggers), and cleanup kits. Make program goal still achievable.
- ◆ Add “pay for itself” grant seeking position. (Note - During discussion Amalia shared concern about having done this in the past without great results and given the current economy it would likely be even more difficult for government to gain funding).
- ◆ IT costs – while perhaps not changeable this year – is very expensive compared to private sector.
- ◆ Shared or backfill cut capacity, e.g. coalition newsletters could help Elders with articles (?) if that capacity is cut.
- ◆ Cut programs in pieces that are discreet blocks – so they can be collectively supported for restoration, e.g. small grants (for all offices at same percentage of that cut level) rather than some cut staff, some communications, etc.
- ◆ Keep Judith.
- ◆ Keep facilitation function if at all possible.

Group 3

1. Cut crime prevention deeper. This was not an item that had unanimous or even consensus agreement, but that one member of the group felt strongly about.
2. Restore the neighborhood small grants funding. There was unanimous agreement on this item.
3. If needed, in order to restore the small grants program, cut either the remainder of the mediation program or make a deeper cut into the Graffiti program. There was unanimous

agreement in the group on this item. We didn't feel we knew enough to know which to cut, but that a) the mediation program affected only a limited number of people, and b) that potentially volunteers could take up the graffiti removal work. If there was a leaning, it was toward cutting the mediation program.

Group 4

- ◆ Recognize that the DCL program has not submitted cuts. Need DCL proposal.
 - Total = \$373,000
 - 5% = \$ 18,650
 - 10% = \$ 37,300
 - 20% = \$ 74,600
- ◆ Concern about level of cuts to Graffiti Program.
- ◆ Concern about cutting two NRC positions.

Group 5

- ◆ Second Round – External Grantee Cuts: Cut small grants program first.
- ◆ Fourth Round Cuts – Options to consider:
 - Community Engagement – hold harmless and do not cut
 - Cut Effective Engagement (Judith)
 - Or other NRC position (Paul) – mediation services with this position
 - Other – invert the cuts as proposed.
- ◆ Other Alternatives/Options to Consider: Consider these first, before Fourth Round cuts:
 - I&R – Increase Information and Referral cut to 20% (.5 FTE and down class supervisor) – remove.
 - Livability-Mediation - Cut Mediation/Facilitation Program completely.
 - Livability-Graffiti – Cut more deeply into free Graffiti removal services – Fee for service.